

PTOL-413A (09-04)  
Approved for use through 07/31/2008. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/940,141 First Named Applicant: Cheline  
Examiner: Hernandez Art Unit: 2144 Status of Application: Final

#### Tentative Participants:

(1) Olga Hernandez (2) Georgann S. Grunbach  
(3) Martin R. Bader (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: August 2, 2005 Proposed Time: 2:00 (AM/PM) E.S.T.

#### Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

### Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art U.S.P.A.N.	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>1-9, 11-20, 23</u>	<u>2002/0178361</u> <u>Genty et al.</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: See Attached.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Martin R. Bader  
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

MARTIN R. BADER  
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

54,736  
Registration Number, if applicable

[Signature]  
Examiner/SPE Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

## DRAFT ARGUMENTS

DATE: July 15, 2005  
TO: Olga Hernandez  
FROM: Martin Bader  
SERIAL NO: 09/940,141  
DOCKET: PD-201118;  
SUBJECT: Draft Arguments for Examiner Interview

Claims 1, 11, 13 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Genty et al. (2002/0178361). Specifically, the office action cites figures 1 and 2 of Genty for teaching the limitations of the independent claims.

Regarding independent claim 1, in part, Applicant claims, "receiving a request to establish a VPN session with a server-side system from at least one client computer out of a plurality of client computers coupled to a modem within a client-side system" and "receiving a new request to establish a new VPN session with a different server-side system from a different client computer out of said plurality of client computers coupled to said modem within said client-side system." Independent claim 1 recites at least two computers coupled to the same modem within a client side system. Figures 1 and 2 of Genty et al. do not show a plurality of computers coupled to the same modem within a client side system. Nor does the written description of Genty et al. disclose a plurality of computers coupled to the same modem within a client side system.